

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 6 are pending in the application. Applicants add new claims 7 - 10. No new matter is added. Support may be found, for example, in Applicants' specification at page 12, line 7 through page 13, line 7; page 16, line 27 through page 18, line 13; and page 19, line 30 through page 20, line 30.

NON-COMPLIANT INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) of December 12, 2000 is found to be non-compliant with respect to listed U.S. Patent Application Serial Number 09/322,444. As no further explanation is provided, Applicants presume this listing has been found to be non-compliant for failure to submit a complete copy of the application. Applicants attach a complete copy of the this application, and respectfully request that the Examiner consider this reference and provided a supplemental PTO-1449 form to Applicants with his initials indicating that the reference has been considered.

OBJECTION TO DRAWING

Figures 14 and 15 of the drawing are objected to for failing to be designated as "Prior Art". Applicants submit that Figures 15 and 16 designate prior art, and propose associated revisions to Figures 15 and 16 as indicated in the attached drawing replacement pages, provided in both marked-up and clean copies. Applicants respectfully request that the proposed revisions be accepted, and that the objections be withdrawn.

OBJECTION TO SPECIFICATION

The specification is objected to with respect to informalities at pages 4 and 5. Applicants thank the Examiner for suggesting amendments to the specification to address the informalities, make the suggested amendments, and respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

OBJECTED CLAIMS

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 3 - 6 are objected to as being dependent on rejected base claim 1, but that each would be allowable if rewritten to include all of the limitations of base claim 1 and any intervening claims. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable for the reasons cited below, and accordingly request that the objections to claims 3 – 6 on that basis be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,559,606 to Jezo et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,212,219 to Shou et al. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jezo in view of Shou and U.S. Patent No. 5,966,411 to Struhsaker. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

In independent claim 1, Applicants claim:

1. An apparatus, comprising:

a plurality of received-signal registers which receive and store therein a plurality of respective received-signal sequences;

a selector which selects one of the received signal sequences stored in said received-signal registers;

at least one code register which stores therein a de-spreading-code sequence;

a multiplication circuit which multiplies the selected one of the received-signal sequences by the de-spreading-code sequence; and

a summation circuit which obtains a sum of results of the multiplication to obtain a correlation between the selected one of the received-signal sequences and the de-spreading-code sequence.

Jezo discloses a correlation apparatus for correlating the contents of a plurality of shift registers with a signal stored in a reference signal register (see, e.g., abstract and FIG. 1 of Jezo). The Examiner acknowledges that Jezo fails to disclose Applicants' claimed selector, and suggests that the selector is made obvious by combining Shou with Jezo.

Shou discloses a spread spectrum communication system including a plurality of shift registers, a multiplexer and a serial/parallel converter for supplying input data to the multiplexer at intervals regulated by a clock signal (see, e.g., FIG. 13 of Shou). The Examiner suggests that MUX 3 of Shou's FIG. 13 is equivalent to Applicants' claimed selector. Applicants respectfully disagree.

As illustrated in FIG. 13, MUX 3 receives outputs from only from shift register 2, and not from shift register 1. As a result, and unlike Applicants' claimed selector, MUX 3 fails to select a signal sequence from one of a plurality of registers, but rather merely accepts a sequence from predetermined shift register 2.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is not made obvious by the combination of Jezo and Shou, and is therefore in condition for allowance. As claims 2 – 6 each depend from allowable claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2 – 6 are also allowable for at least this reason.

CONCLUSION

An earnest effort has been made to be fully responsive to the Examiner's objections. In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that claims 1 – 10, consisting of

independent claims 1 and 8, and the claims dependent therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

Passage of this case to allowance is earnestly solicited. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, she is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged on Deposit Account 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas D. Bean
Reg. No. 44,528

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304

Katten Muchin Zavis Rosenman
575 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10022-2585
(212) 940-8729
Docket No.: FUJI 18.099 (100794-11562)
TJB:pm